The present proposal when referred to the same quarter has been rejected on financial grounds. In these circumstances, Government regret nothing can be done in the manner indicated.

23. Commutation of Tiruppuvaram paid by ryots to jenmies into cash, one-half at 6 chs. and the other half at 11 chs. per parah.

Mr. K. Appathura Iyer B. A., B. L., (Nedumangad) stated that Tiruppuvaram is a portion of Sirkar tax assigned by Government in former days for the enjoyment of jenmies. The question was whether the latter could claim its recovery now as Michavaram or only as tax on pandarapattom and otti lands from which Tiruppuvaram is made payable to them. Being a grant by Government which Government, if they now chose to realize direct, could recover only in money at the rates fixed by the rules from time to time, the member thought that the jenmies themselves were not entitled to a greater indulgence in this respect, but should abide by the rules in force for the realization of Sirkar tax *viz.*, one-half at 6 chs. and the other half at 11 chs. per parah.

Reply.—On this question the opinions of the Peishkars have been called for, on receipt of which orders will be passed.

24. Separation of Magisterial from Revenue functions.

Mr. C. Padmanabha Pillai (Karunagapalli) stated that at present the Tahsildars found no time to do either their revenue or magisterial duties satisfactorily owing to a multiplicity of functions devolving on them and requested that separate Magistrates and Revenue officers might be appointed by Government to afford greater relief to the people.

Mr. N. Kesavan Valiathan (Kartikapalli) advocated the same views.

Mr. K. G. Sesha Aiyar B. A., B. L., (Central Association, Trivandrum) said that this question was being agitated all over British India and that even in Travancore, the experiment was tried some years ago. It was highly necessary to invest distinct officers with revenue and judicial functions instead of combining them in the same officer as at present and he requested that this suggestion might be taken up for the early consideration of Government.

Reply.—The system advocated already obtains in so far as Sub-

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

magistrates are concerned, and practically Division Assistants also. As regards Tahsildars and Peishkars, the subject requires careful consideration. We shall watch what may be done elsewhere and see whether our finances will admit of the necessary expenditure being incurred on this account even if this were feasible or expedient.

25. Dilatoriness in the disposal of revenue petitions.

Mr. K. Padmanabhan Tampi (Taluk Association, Kalkulam) represented that it took 3 or 4 years for a Revenue officer to dispose of a petition and even cases in which final orders had been passed did not receive attention. He requested that a rule might be laid down prescribing the period within which revenue petitions should be disposed of by the authorities concerned.

Reply—The representation seems to be well-founded to some extent and a great deal could be done in the matter. You know how things are being dealt with now. Any one conversant with the transaction of business in the Huzur Cutcherry must know what spirit should pervade the Divisional and other subordinate offices in receiving petitions either in or outside the office room, in hearing the wants of the people, in speedily disposing of them and in immediately giving endorsements. Whatever defects exist ought to be and are being removed and I have no doubt that other officers are imbibing this spirit and following it up in practice. Instructions are being daily issued and all unnecessary delays noticed. You may rest assured that in this important matter there will be appreciable improvement with which, I hope, you will have reason to be satisfied when we meet here again.

26. Discontinuance of the practice of clerks taking depositions in revenue cases and avoidance of inordinate delay in the disposal of these cases.

Mr. R. Narayana Pillai (Ettumanur) said that in escheat and other cases clerks took down the depositions of parties and the Tahsildars merely signed them, on the ground that they had Devaswom work to attend to. In the Judicial department, judges and munsiffs took down depositions in their own hand and the speedy disposal of cases was insisted on. The member suggested that a rule might be laid down specifying the period within which revenue cases should be disposed of by Tahsildars and all statements written up by themselves, and that as a relief to the Tahsildars the Devaswom work might be ordered to be looked after by the Deputy Tahsildars.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly